



Public Comment And Responses to Public Comment

July 17, 2008

Draft Community Values Statement: Published 6/20/08
Comment Period: Friday 6/20/08 to Monday 6/30/08

Comment 1:

Sarah,

I am concerned with this not being able to be changed, as the wording we have been so careful of these many meetings needs to be looked at. So I do not understand the rush to push this through.

I believe that at least the word marinas needs to be added as it was one thing a lot of people including property owners wanted and there is no way to accommodate Transient boaters if there are no slips at marinas to put them.

The other is the word Transient in place of temporary as temporary has such a negative meaning like it would be taken away.

Thank you for listening to my concerns. I'm am not trying to be a pain in the neck about this stuff. I just want to bring it to your awareness. As you know the Document is important to me as I am sure it is to all of us.

- Increase citizen access to boating: increase moorings, dinghy docks. and marinas. Many people were in favor of more marinas weather it be owned by private property owners or the city.
- Mix recreational and commercial boating in ways that would create compatible boating activity in the harbor.
- Encourage access by water with abundant temporary public slips.(Change temporary to transient. Some how the word temporary has a negative connotation)

Thank You ~ _/) ~

Filippo Capt. Phil Cusumano

Comment 2:

June 2008

It is critical for Gloucester to retain a sustainable fishing industry. We will need marine industrial infrastructure if there is to be fishing in the future. Fishing has been Gloucester's livelihood and is its heritage. Fishing defines Gloucester. Gloucester is fishing.

Community Development Department

City of Gloucester (978) 281-9781

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

A sustainable future efficient fishery requires less waterfront real estate for infrastructure. The Harborfront is obviously an underutilized resource as evidenced by deteriorating piers and languishing waterfront properties.

City government is facing mandates for deferred upgrades to its sewer system and rising costs such as employee benefits, energy, and other needed infrastructure upgrades. The City is obviously hurting financially. It is incumbent upon City leadership to revitalize the Harbor and reinvigorate the local economy to increase the tax base to properly fund City government.

When the fishery recovers it will face challenges like further industrialization of the coastline (LNG, increased shipping, etc), pollution, climate change, fish farming, restrictive regulations, increasing energy costs, competition, etc. A less reliable fishery signals a shift to encourage other marine-related industry - marine tech/biotech, aquaculture, ocean research, etc.

Let's not throw the baby out with the bath water and dismantle the working harbor. Port side support industries, freezer space, and marine infrastructure will still be needed in the future. Let's have a more creative design process i.e. a mezzanine marine research center with pedestrian plaza above existing freezers.

The 2006 Harbor Plan may not be perfect, but is a template to work with. It would be simple to redraw the zoning map to distinguish at least two zones within and outside the Designated Port Area. Allowing more uses outside the DPA is an initiative Gloucester can undertake on her own without petitioning the State to change the DPA.

Overlay Zoning Districts to further differentiate desired change/growth patterns in specific areas like Harbor Cove or East Gloucester are important tools to fine-tune the overall plan. Perhaps the Designated Port Area should remain just that to protect the portside requirements of a sustainable fishery.

Few would advocate for hyper-yuppification of the waterfront or rampant harborfront condominiumization. However, a carefully crafted and targeted promotion of tourism (eco, historic, cultural, artistic, etc.) is not evil incarnate for the fishing industry. We can protect and promote fishing and increase tourism and recreational boating and integrate other commercial uses on some areas of the Harborfront.

Opening more public waterfront access, encouraging recreational boating and yachting (even Blackburn liked to sail), expanding mooring fields and guest moorings, increasing guest services and tourist-friendly facilities, and integrating some other commercial uses in some harbor front areas are options to consider.

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

The devil is in the details. More visitors will require more facilities - parking, dockage, shuttles, launches, etc. But, fishing, boating, expanded Harborfront uses, and tourism uses can all peacefully co-exist in a well-crafted plan focusing on an expanded vision for the Harbor while protecting a sustainable fishery.

Opening public access along the waterfront with a Harborwalk is an excellent idea. Linking the Harborfront to Main Street would complete an important connection that has been missing since Urban Renewal.

Taking the I4C2 parcel by eminent domain (or partnering with the owner) and making this property a focal point for the City on the Harborfront by creating a world-class tourist attraction would sync with fine existing institutions like the Gloucester Maritime Heritage Center, Schooner Adventure, and Cape Ann Museum. A Fisherman's/Farmer's Market, a Museum of Fishing, an Aquarium or another compatible core destination attraction would provide the synergy and economic engine to drive a rejuvenation of the City.

Turning the West End of Main Street into a bricked pedestrian mall (e.g. Essex Street in Salem) and linking it with the Harbor via a Harborwalk could complete a pedestrian experience from Main Street to a core attraction at I4C2 and then along the Harborwalk through the Fort and onto an extended Boulevard connecting with Stage Fort Park.

A well-crafted Harbor Plan could revitalize the Harborfront, honor Gloucester's history and place, protect a sustainable fishery, and put the entire City back on sound financial footing with increased visitor dollars. It is time to proactively move forward.

Daren Donovan

Comment 3

Dear Sarah and Harbor Plan panel members,

You have done a remarkable job of distilling the thoughts and ideas of the hundreds of citizens who came out to comment on Harbor Development.

One additional point I would like to make, however, is that although respect for the environment may be implicit in the draft Community Values document that is posted on the city website, I believe a more direct reference to the need for both energy conservation and the protection of natural resources is warranted. I also believe that this reflects values that are held dear by many Gloucester residents.

To support this statement, I draw your attention first to the fact that the City of Gloucester has established a committee, the Gloucester Renewable Energy Committee (GREC.) In describing its purpose, GREC states that "as a coastal community, (we are)

Community Development Department

City of Gloucester (978) 281-9781 <http://www.ci.gloucester.ma.us>

Page 3 of 16

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

concerned about (our)health, environment, economy and marine resources” and the committee seeks “to take advantage of the economic and social benefits of energy efficiency and renewable energy.”

Also, in the Community Development Comprehensive Plan for the City of Gloucester, there are specific sections devoted to both “Harbor and Waterfront” and “Natural Resources and the Environment.” Although a deep appreciation of the environment is clear throughout the Plan, I believe that three strategies from the Natural Resources and Environment” section are especially relevant here.

- *Develop a Natural Resources Management Plan.*
- *Strengthen city policies that address pollution from marine-related activities, and continue programs to reduce pollution in the inner harbor.*
- *Develop programs that promote stewardship of natural resources and their associated ecosystems.*

Therefore, I urge you to add to the list of community values (perhaps in the section re: approach to harbor development) a statement such as this:

- **Take full advantage of the economic, social and environmental benefits of promoting energy efficiency and good stewardship of our natural resources.**

Thank you for all the hard work you have done for Gloucester.

Sincerely,
Linda Brayton

Comment 4:

Sarah, Hope it's not too late. Read the list. Thank you for posting for the city to respond.

Not sure what "creative economy" means to the plan.

Could mean galleries or shops with hand made goods.

Does it mean studio rentals? (non live-in)?

Jason Grow and several others are looking at spaces downtown for something like an art center. Perhaps there would be space to rent for that? or to buy? Although I do understand keeping the spaces flexible so can be turned back into maritime related.

Good luck with all this!

Ruth

Comment 5:

Community Development Department
City of Gloucester (978) 281-9781 <http://www.ci.gloucester.ma.us>

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

Sara,

Thank you for the opportunity provided by conducting these community listening posts regarding the harbor development. It was a unique and enriching experience for me and a great opportunity to become involved in a civic process that otherwise would not be made available to me.

Upon review of subject document, I would like to address the second section which states:

"Make the Harbor a hub of community activity. Provide access to, along, and across the water."

In addition to the language used here such as "Create public access..."

Provide ways that citizens...can both get to and onto the water."

"Increase citizen access to boating:

I would request that the concept of "community boating center" be expressed and stated as such. I believe all of these above stated concepts could be addressed and fulfilled through the means of a community boating center. The concept was addressed by myself and others at the listening post meetings. Funding was addressed by Marty Stephan who has a serious interest in such.

Thank you for your consideration in this process. Patti Page

Comment 6:

I was quite upset when I saw the Times article on the panel summary before I actually saw the document itself. I think the panel understood "public access" a lot better than the Times reporter did. The Times reporter equated "public access" to slips for private pleasure boats. I equate slips for private boats to "owners and guests only" signs. The panel said nothing about yacht marinas at all. Good for them. I would indeed like to see more public access. I think the yachtspeople who spoke were clear that they wanted more moorings and dingy floats. They did not stress slips, permanent or temporary. I was very surprised that no one mentioned regular launch service, which has worked both for the public landing and yacht clubs in Marblehead for as long as I can remember. Our shortage of dingy floats is inexcusable and I am sure hurts restaurants and stores badly. As a former ocean racer I have to agree with the people who said a community boating center is needed badly, to provide not only facilities for sailing and rowing but also the basic needs of visitors such as showers and washer-dryers. Perhaps the new harbormaster pier can be adapted when built I still think your use of "recreational boats" when the regulations and ordinance say "yacht marinas" is misleading. I think that confuses the Lannon or a six pack charter boat with a pleasure yacht. One type of recreational boat is allowed in the DPA and MI zone. The other is not. I can not wait for this to reach the public hearing stage on zoning and attempts to mess with the DPA. I feel strongly that we have the whole outer harbor, Eastern Point, Annisquam River, Smith Cove and Lobster Cove for yachts. The DPA should remain for fishing boats, tug boats, charter boats, dive boats, whale watch boats, harbor tour boats, cruise ships and other commercial boats. I might accept compromise on the East Gloucester shore to make already existing yacht use conforming, but the parts that are commercial should stay commercial.

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

Damon Cummings
1063 Washington St.

Comment 7

hi sarah, if not too late to comment on the draft in the last hour ..

re: p 2 of 2 - "Use caution so as not to lose our character". possible to add "**and true identity**" to the end of the sentence? or just identity would be ok as well.

I heard a multitude of speakers say that gloucester is "real", a real place.
we need to evolve an economic engine around our identity and distinct character.
let's face it, without our true cast of characters, we would be just like any other port!

also, what better selling point to the state, as well for future tourism, than to mention the distinct honor of gloucester being the oldest fishing seaport in the country?

being home to the oldest artist colony in the country is also a distinction.

I mention this in my advertising for the heights. peter van ness also mentioned it at the magnolia post.

gloucester is a destination by it's very character, it's uniqueness and how it is different.

if the characteristics change, then the identity is lost and indifferent, rather than "different".

I think we all agree on that. recognize and celebrate such differences in all that we do!

we need to make gloucester a destination based on such distinction. such document should reflect it.

if possible, this needs to be further mentioned, in the same manner as we *distinctly* clarified other parts of this draft.

I leave it up to you. all in all, a great document don't you think? let's put it to work! lol. - roz

Comment 8:

I was recently at one of the Harbor Plan community meetings. It was announced that we could go to the City's website to add some thoughts. So when I went to Gloucester's website and couldn't find an area for feedback, I took your email address down. Here are my continuing thoughts, Ms Buck:

Vance Packard, in his 1960 The Waste Makers, wrote a passage about the auto industry's dilemma when it couldn't structurally make

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

cars any longer and lower. It was forced to make them shorter and higher -- with the odd result that the "car of the future" saw itself going the other way just two years later! Its dilemma was, after it had succeeded in convincing the public that "sleekness" was desirable, How do we make the public want to purchase a car that is un-sleek?

I think that Gloucester is a city much like the car in the story. We are just now getting around to the Should we or shouldn't we...have a shopping center -- just when the rest of the world is realizing what they have lost by having shopping centers and that their downtowns are really valuable. We are about to get cool -- just because we haven't changed that much!

Let's look at what Gloucester does have, not at what it doesn't have. It has: a downtown wilderness area (referred to in the meeting as a "non-used parcel"), an un-chain drug store, a grocery store, a cobbler, a variety of restaurants, bakeries, a department store, a senior center, consignments shops, hardware store, lumber yard, several clothing stores, an animal shelter, several furniture stores, several antique shops, a library, a tool rental store, a party store, a small appliances repair shop, bike shops, a framing shop, beauty salons, massage parlors, jewelery stores, coffee shops, thrift shops, a copier store, a museum, post office, courthouse, historic houses, a boardwalk, a Y -- quite a downtown! -- and all within walking distance of each other. It has a newspaper. It has buses, taxis, a train(!), and a bicycle shop that rents bikes. It has a Buddhist garden - with its door open to anyone who wants to sit, away from the noise and bustle - ten paces off Main Street! It also has many places for tourists to stay, parks, and cemeteries. In other words, Gloucester has a pretty healthy diversity of shops. And it has empty stores -- to be filled by enterprising individuals. (If Gloucester were in Europe, its cemeteries would be places in which to casually wander about and reflect.) It has a traffic system with so few traffic lights that it actually requires civility from its drivers. It has really likeable residents.

What we need to do is take excellent care of what we do have. We need to address our litter problem. We need to protect our wild places. We need our cops to walk the beat again, or, for more outlying beats, ride bicycles -- and to know the people - especially our kids - by name! We need more civility. We need greener buildings. We need to be on the forefront of the green movement. We need to be an exemplary city. We don't need any more fuss and bother to attract tourists -- we just need to improve the way we already do things.

I humbly submit that we think in terms of IMPROVING WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE and stop thinking about GETTING MORE and risk losing our center. I don't know much about finances and perhaps sound like a hapless, unrealistic pollyanna. But *perhaps* the artist that I am has the real answer. I believe Gloucester's answer exists within ourselves. Let's make Gloucester the Emerald City of the east coast. Let's do it so well that our neighbors will learn from us - and we can altogether become the Emerald Coast! That'll surely draw in the money.

I suggest that we call a halt to some of the building going on. That we designate the free-growing area on Rogers St. a Forever Wild Site. That we designate Dogtown a Forever Wild Site. That we pay off our bill to the Cambridge Seven and hire a local firm if we need planning advice. That we transform ourselves into a Better Gloucester, not a Bigger Gloucester. Less is more.

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

I will close with a poem I read in Robert Bly's Iron John. He is quoting from the Persian poet, Rumi, using the translator Mathnawi:

*You've seen a herd of goats
Going down to the water.*

*The lame and dreamy goat
Brings up the rear.*

*There are worried faces about that one,
But ah, how they're laughing, because look,*

*As they return
That goat is the leader!*

*There are many different kinds of knowing,
The lame goat's kind is a branch
That traces back to the roots of Presence.*

*Learn from the lame goat,
And lead the herd Home.*

Thanks for listening, Ms. Buck...

Comment 9:

Hi,

I was unable to attend the meetings upon which the plan has been developed, so this suggestion is late in the process -- for which I apologize.

While I appreciate that Gloucester enjoys an enviable history of fishing, it is clear to me that fishing is unlikely to return to be the economic force that it once was. And the fishing and fish processing industry is likely to be more capital intensive.

If we are to lift Gloucester's economy it must be in large part by expanding employment opportunities, and fishing does not offer that hope. If Gloucester is to flourish again, the best chance will be to make the city a more compelling the destination for tourists.

Community Development Department

City of Gloucester (978) 281-9781 <http://www.ci.gloucester.ma.us>

Page 8 of 16

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

With the likely ever increasing cost of gas, folk will be inclined to travel less, and seek destinations closer to home and accessible by rail.

Major assets that we enjoy include:

- * Maritime history
- * Extensive underdeveloped waterfront property
- * A building Cruise Ship destination
- * Excellent road and rail access

But we lack a focal point to promote and attract. So I propose that we approach the Pentagon and obtain an old aircraft carrier from the mothballed fleet, and bring her to Gloucester to be moored permanently along side in the city -- possibly at the State Fish Pier -- creating a major focus for a "Gloucester Marine Park". That would create a major attraction as has been done in New Bedford (<http://www.battleshipcove.org>) and New York (<http://www.intrepidmuseum.org/intrepidmuseum>)

We should also consider creating a parking area outside the city center (Blackburn Industrial Park?), with shuttle busses to minimize traffic congestion within the center.

We should promote Gloucester as a destination city, featuring the rail link and parking "off Route 128"

We could even, in combination with Rockport, mount a promotion for spending a weekend on Cape Anne, combining the attractions of both cities.

Again, I apologize for my tardy contribution, but I feel that the concept has the potential for a major impact on Gloucester's future.

Regards,

Andre

Andrew Campbell

Comment 10:

06/27/08

Dear Ms. Buck,

as you invited per newspaper and website – and recently reiterated by Mr. Cadematori during Planning Board Meeting of 06/23/08 – here are

Community Development Department

City of Gloucester (978) 281-9781 <http://www.ci.gloucester.ma.us>

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

1. our Corrections to the published record on the “Visioning”-Sessions on the Harbor’s future; and
2. several Additional Points on your Dept’s approach to the matter and your scope of discussion.

1. **Corrections due to omissions from the published record** of the 3-min each allowable public statements by Phil Bolger (PB) and Suzanne Altenburger (SA) across all five “Visioning” sessions:

City-Hall Session

SA opened with the Statement that Gloucester is the recent recipient of an income-guarantee very rare for any community in Massachusetts or anywhere. It comes from the confluence of federal regulatory and enforcement by NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service) and the legal power of environmental watchdog groups (NGOs) that monitor NMFS both to guarantee through full federal jurisprudence and enforcement the rebuilding to sustainable levels of the natural resource (seafood-harvest) in our coastal and offshore waters. Few communities can plan far ahead long-term; even military bases enjoy less protection. SA and PB emphasized the six industries based on this port’s DPA status.

East-Gloucester Session

SA emphasized the legal reality with its obligations and opportunities of the state’s DPA designation of Gloucester to which City leaders signed on in 1978. She referenced the successful trackrecord of property-owners who learned to maximize DPA-based economic opportunities from timely ‘grandfathering’ of their traditional usage-patterns to full embrace and prosperity of DPA status as reflected in significant new construction, reconstruction, repair and continuous marine-industrial trade all over the Inner Harbor. PB elaborated.

Lanesville Session

SA took issue with the persistent pessimistic tone of the presentation, with its emphasis on “decay” and “constricting regulation limiting property-owners’ economic opportunities”. Based on some research, SA questioned that there was any “majority” never mind a “united waterfront property-owners group” amongst the Chamber of Commerce’s vocal proponents of DPA-undermining legal changes to state’s interest in one of the last fully-functional working ports in Mass. Many inner Harbor property-owners have left the Chamber over the years. And a significant and commercially-viable group of owners rejects outright these proposals as they are designed to favor those who did not fully study the DPA provisions – rights and obligations (!) -, did not ‘grandfather’ their lots and endeavors when possible – or did not reinvest into their wharves and waterfront-assets in order to avoid this ‘decay’ so prominently featured in the slide-show. SA expressed sympathy for a few ‘hard-luck’ cases that could be tended to.

Annisquam Session

SA emphasized full-time/year-round ‘Value-adding’ marine-industrial opportunities on the Inner Harbor by

- a) boat-building of fishingboat-, pleasureboat-, institutional craft hulls too long/large to ‘road-haul’

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

- b) fish-cutting and –processing to highest value-added levels to match distinct market-segment both right here in the harbor to minimize any transportation-cost of ‘unimproved’ product. SA rejected schemes to build boats ‘elsewhere’ and cut fish in Boston. Gloucester’s job and tax-base belong to this Inner Harbor working waterfront.

Magnolia Session

SA and PB emphasized the future of advanced 21st century ‘green’ low-fuel-consumption fishing craft to sustainably harvest the resources in order to sustain the fleet, this port and this City’s budget.

2. Additional Points of Concerns:

-a.) TIMING: Hearings were scheduled right *after* the Fleet went back to work *after* a two-month *shore-stay*!

-b.) NO PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN via MEDIA *BEFORE* HEARINGS:

It is problematic to ask the public for informed input without prior detailed lay-out of all the options *in print* to allow for our town an appropriate weighing of options – both broad policy-matters such as devaluing DPA-provisions or detail-solutions for certain locations.

-c.) REVITALIZATION OF THE HARBOR *WITHOUT* EMPHASIS ON FULL-TIME/YEAR-ROUND VALUE-ADDING INDUSTRIES ?!:

It is remarkable ‘planning-policy’ indeed that the most favored proposals by this Dept. are primarily seasonal/low-wage ventures, granting exceptional economic advantages to a limited number of vocal property-owners through historically unrepealable legal changes once passed into regulation. This Dept’s emphasis of undermining the spirit of opportunity of the DPA-status protecting this Port at a time of unprecedented and inherently *temporary* decline is particularly remarkable as a uniquely idiosyncratic definition of community-planning. ‘Sustainability of Port and City’ appears writ small.

-d.) NEAR COMPLETE REJECTION OF BOAT/SHIP-BUILDING AS A LEADING FULL-TIME/YEAR-ROUND CARREER-PATH INDUSTRIAL PURSUIT?!:

Whether counting since Mayor Kirk’s inauguration in early January’08, or the time since the March 26th Joint Session of Mayor, City-Council and Planning Board, this option has been persistently swept off the table, with personal your disinterest in any form of direct exploration of respective opportunities remaining inexplicable. This is a most lucrative industry, particularly in a fully-zoned port, with an established fleet, on the Intra-Coastal Waterway, in the world’s largest commercial- and pleasure-boat market, at a time of energy-cost levels that will dictate dramatically more efficient hull-geometries and propulsion-solutions for any and all water-craft, from fishing, over whale-watching, marine-scientific research, governmental patrol/enforcement, etc.

This Department’s apparent full embrace of the decidedly under-ambitious Chamber of Commerce’s ‘plan’ for this port is a remarkable public display of ‘public policy’-choices that are hard to justify outside that circle of parties.

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

To repeat, we observe the staunch favoring of seasonal low-paying/non-career jobs and joblets that will at best – and not even that is guarantee at \$5+for boat-diesel – favor marina-oriented owners of certain lots.

-e.) DISSATISFIED INNER HARBOR PROPERTY-OWNERS SHOULD BE OFFERED AN OUTER-HARBOR-BASED “Ten-Pound Island” MARINA COMPACT on the basis of ‘Right of First Refusal’ to allow a much larger, full-rationalized operations-approach welcoming residents and visitors alike.

Yours sincerely

Phil Bolger

Susanne Alenburger

Comment 11:

Hi Sarah,

If you are looking for how the citizens weigh in on issues to be what is reflected in the Values then I offer this information that I don't see reflected in the Draft currently circulated.

As I said I have only had time to look over the comments made at City Hall on the City web site and have utilized these so you can also go back and count who made similar statements. I found 8 people commented in favor of the previous draft harbor plan, maintaining the MI or were in favor of the DPA. They were Jay McLaughlin, Henry Ferrini, Damon, Peter Anastas, Valerie Nelson, Suzanne A, Phil Bolger, and Kate Banks. There were at most 7-8 comments that supported the property owners plan in some way-3 were very clear-Joe Ciarametaro, Ruth Pino MJ Montignino. Five others were less clearly in favor of that plan or were multifaceted comments or made allusion to support for harbor zoning change: Ab K taked about both the draft plan and not dictating to property owners, Richard R has his own plan but it allows expanded opportunity for property owners, Janice Shea equated Main Street's survival to the harbor and Bill Hayes supported recreational boating next to commercial as did Graham Tuttle(although he placed recreational in the outer harbor). You already know I am in favor of the MI zone and the most liberal plan I can even conceive of is the original draft harbor plan---so this is my most fair estimation of what the public said, at the first meeting.

In the draft values, guiding the harbor development, I clearly see reflected the later 7-8 comments (Make Gloucester a welcoming port for transient boating, mix recreational and commercial boating). I guess many "values" could be seen to answer either perspective: create flexibility that promotes investment in harbor properties, Encourage uses that rely on water access, support family owned businesses, provide direction based on evolving world realities, clarify the complex regulatory and permitting environment. Which perspective do these represent?

This is still, therefore, the GREY area where I do not see concensus has emerged, as yet. I do feel that the City had a perspective at the beginning of this process, and when the grey areas are discussed the discussion goes in the direction of more development than the community at large is actually discussing or that is wise for the future of the community and its values.

Please consider the 8 clear comments on maintaining an industrial harbor with some increase in commercial use. Eight people out of 29 were clearly NOT in favor of a recreational harbor. Where are their clear voices?

The terms mixed use, recreational boating and evolving world realities need to be terms the community agrees on. Is mixed use

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

what we have currently grandfathered into East Gloucester for example, or is it mixed commercial and industrial or mixed recreational and industrial and commercial? What is recreational boating-is it yacht parking allowed in Gloucester harbor or is it tie ups for transient tall ships, cruise boats, whale watch boats, charters and tour boats? And what are evolving world realities?- are they the upcoming protein shortages so in the news lately or the depressed housing and retail sectors reflected in Wall Street's downturn or the weakening of the fishing industry?

I think some issues stated as values that clearly can be acted on as having agreement: are considering traffic and parking needs whatever else happens, maintaining and enhancing public harbor access(I4C2 is the single most critical missing link if there is one), we don't want to lose our character (how that is accomplished is quite complex and involves housing more than anything), increasing citizen boating, linking historic and educational resources to the harbor, water taxi's, places for tall ships to berth, more water visitors without cars (but not necessarily tying up the inner harbor), more marine research and good job opportunities related to the harbor.

And one of the most critical points is not just design and architectural review but what Bill Hayes said in the Harbor room meeting that the City needs to ENFORCE what is permitted. This is what creates for me the most distrust in the City government of the past and it has yet to be repaired with the concerned citizenry and is really I think at the heart of this matter and the LACK of consensus. I want the STATE involved in protecting the harbor because historically I have found them more trustworthy than our CITY government in terms of the reality of what projects proposed actually become. That is a sad statement given the level of State corruption. This City has operated on old boy, old family money, EDIC, Chamber, City/judiciary linked favoritism, certain family favoritism, dysfunctional city departments, functionally corrupt city departments, back and hand slapping and lack of oversight and enforcement as long as I have lived here.

I want to believe that things are now different and are transparent now. The harbor is the true test. Unfortunately, that is the most critical issue and the one at hand in the hands of an untested administration. I am worried by the speed attached to this process under these circumstances. I wish I was more thrilled so far. I am not, however, yet discouraged and continue to hope the mayor and those surrounding her do not take the decision-making into their own hands and bow to the money interests and the old boys in town but find a way for more economic stability to exist without destroying our precious working PORT and its history, rather than sell us out to the benefit of a few-which is currently the American way. Lets be community minded instead!

I'm going to try to review the other listening posts on the web site but it is time consuming to try to categorize the comments. I'm also going to look at the Plan 2000 for insight.

Sincerely, Marcia Hart R.N.

Comment 12:

Hello Ms. Buck.

I wish to make a clarification (or two) about the comments that I made at the Mayor's "Listening Posts".

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

The first is that my opposition to recreational marinas within the DPA extends to the creation of *new* facilities. I am in no way opposed to maintaining the existing recreational dockage that presently has "grandfathered" status.

As I mentioned at the East Gloucester forum, I sadly watched as Nantucket lost it's last vestige of her historic working port. The "Great Harbor Yacht Club" bought the last working portion of that harbor and created a very exclusive facility with the result being that significant public access to the harbor in that area has been forever lost. (here is a link to the intro page of "Save our Waterfront" <http://www.saveourwaterfront.org/intro/> my sister, Christine, sat on their steering committee).

Nantucket found themselves caught off guard with a gap in their zoning regulations that made this sad event possible. The existence of DPA status would have helped them preserve their working waterfront.

I feel very strongly that the boundaries of our DPA remain as defined. Our zoning regulations should be carefully tied to what the DPA regulations allow. This will ensure that our harbor will remain the treasure that it has been and fulfill the vision for the future of our working harbor to reflect what our population has so eloquently expressed . If we are not diligent with this we could find ourselves standing back in awe and wondering "how did that happen?" just as the Nantucketers did.

I also feel that Gloucester has a privilege and responsibility to hold up to the stewardship of protecting our harbor as one of the "scarce and non-renewable resources of the marine economy..." (301 CMR 25.01(2)).

We should not take this lightly.

Thank you for all your hard work !

Cate Banks

Comment 13:

I reviewed the Powerpoint from the community meetings along with the comments. I did not see any mention of the Gorton's facility next to AmeriCold. Does that facility fit into the redevelopment plan? If so, can it operate without the cold storage?

Thank you,

Susan Brandvold

Responses to the comments:

Comment 1: Panel states that they heard recreational “dockage” but not the word marinas. Panel states that how the recreational dockage is created is outside the scope of their charge, which was to reflect back the themes of the community expressed in the public meetings.

Comment 2: Panel appreciates the comments. Panel notes two areas in which the values statement was not clear enough and made the following two changes: 1) strengthened on page 2, paragraph 3, line 3 regarding traffic and parking, and 2) added on page 2, paragraph 1, new last line regarding the role of tourism in the city’s economy.

Comment 3: Panel appreciates the comment, but refrains from adding themes to that which they heard from the listening posts.

Comment 4: Panel clarifies their intent with the words “creative economy” by changing on page 2, paragraph 1, line 11, to “Foster the creation and production of art as a legitimate supporting commercial use for the working waterfront.”

Comment 5: Panel changes page 2, paragraph 2, line 3 to the following: “Increase citizen access to boating: (examples mentioned included increased moorings, dinghy docks, public tie-ups, dockage for recreational boats, and a community boating center.”)

Comment 6: Panel notes and appreciates the comments.

Comment 7: Panel adds “and identity” to page 2, paragraph 4, line 4.

Comment 8: Panel notes and appreciates the comments.

Comment 9: Panel notes the suggestions and refers to actions taken in response to comment 2 above.

Comment 10: Panel notes that boatbuilding has been and continues to be an allowable use in the harbor.

Comment 11: Panel notes and appreciates the comments. Panel adds to page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, the words “and enforce”.

Comment 12: Thank you for the clarification and additional comments. I found the community conversation very powerful in that it really did speak “outside the box.” It wasn’t pro or con DPA, but about what kinds of activity that citizens wanted and found appropriate for the harbor.

Public Comment on draft Community Values

July 17, 2008

What is a challenge for us, somewhat, is to figure out why the grandfathered marinas are so successful and appropriate but that new marinas would not be. Let me know if you have insights into that.

Another challenge is that while we have a distinct interest in preserving hub port uses (like the ice factory), there is no question that these businesses are at high risk of failure if we don't get some economically viable uses into them or combined with them.

The current DPA regulations are quite rigid, mathematical, and arcane (impenetrable to applicants and even local officials.) The community turnout and comment is a way we can try to customize DPA regulations to Gloucester harbor so that it thrives within the context of state and local stewardship.

Thanks again for the comment, and I will pass it on to the Community Panel for their final revisions.

Comment 13: The recent Harbor Plan meetings have been about having our community talk about what is important to us on the waterfront and what kinds of activity and development should be promoted to encourage a healthier economic climate and active use in the harbor. We don't have a "redevelopment plan" in the sense of taking buildings or public redevelopment of private property.

Gorton's is a valued employer in the city and the cold storage buildings are important to the operation of their business. As you may know, there are three cold storage buildings owned by Americold as well as one owned by Gortons. The City is aware of the importance of cold storage to several businesses including Gorton's.

The East Gloucester freezer facility was used for visioning because it no longer uses its edge along the water, thereby removing all activity from a long stretch of harbor front. It speaks to how we define "water-dependent" uses when we regulate the waterfront. No one is advocating displacing Gorton's nor ignoring the relationship of the freezers to Gorton's operations.